

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 have been examined. Claims 9 and 10 have been added. Claims 1-10 are all the claims pending in the application.

Formal matters

Applicant thanks the Examiner for accepting the drawings as filed on November 14, 2001, and for acknowledging claim to foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for reviewing and initialing the documents disclosed in the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on November 14, 2001.

Claim rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,887,110 to Sakamoto. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites the feature of a selection means for selection one of encoding moving picture data stored in a first storage means and re-encoded data stored in a second storage means for each picture frame. The Examiner maintains that this feature is met by Sakamoto at col. 8, lines 30-42 and claim 7. However, Applicant respectfully disagrees.

At col. 8, lines 30-42 and claim 7, Sakamoto describes an exemplary case of producing fast playback coded video data for four times faster playback. First, normal playback coded video data is obtained by encoding the original video frames by a first video coding scheme using both inter-frame and intra-frame coding. Then, one of every four video frames of the normal playback coded video data is sequentially decoded to obtain decoded video frames in a

sequence. In decoding the one of four frames, the decoder uses “appropriate coded frame data” necessary for decoding. Claim 7 describes a similar set of steps. The Examiner will appreciate that this passage does not describe, and therefore does not disclose, selecting between encoded and re-encoded data; rather it describes the process of decoding one of every four frames of data. Decoding one of every four frames of data is not re-encoding, as that term is used in the claim, because the term “re-encoding” in the claim concerns using intra-frame encoding. Moreover, since the passage does not disclose selecting between encoded and re-encoded data, it cannot logically disclose making the selection *for each picture frame*, as also required by the claim. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over Sakamoto for at least these reasons, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection. Claims 2-4 are patentable at least based on their dependencies.

Claim 5 recites a similar feature to that discussed above with respect to claim 1, and therefore is patentable at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Claims 6-8 are patentable at least based on their dependencies. Applicant therefore respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

New Claims

Applicant has added two new claims in order to claim additional features of the invention.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Appln No. 09/987,246

Q67253

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin C. Kunzendorf
Registration No. 58,308

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 12, 2006